



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,607	11/21/2000	Marvin T. Ling	2817-A-19	1103

7590 05/14/2003
CAHILL, SUTTON & THOMAS P.L.C.
ATTN: Charles R. Hoffman
155 Park One
2141 E. Highland Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85016

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/717,607

Applicant(s)

LING ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen M Brinich

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 4-23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 24-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-3 & 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roye.

Re claims 1-3 & 24-27, Roye discloses (column 2, line 41 - column 3, line 39) an arrangement for forming a digital representation of an image in which slices ("objects") are grabbed, trivial gaps ("noise images") are separated from significant information ("essential images"), the significant information is marked for retention while the trivial gaps are discarded, and a reduced noise version of the image is reconstructed containing only the former.

Re claims 24-27, an implementation of the Roye system using a processor running a stored program (Appendix A) is disclosed.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 4-23 are allowed.
4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claims 4-5 & 22-23 (and dependent claims 6-21), the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited arrangement of

Art Unit: 2624

determining a line skew angle in relationship to objects determined to be representative of essential image data.

Response to Arguments

5. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the distinction between the "slices" of the Roye reference and the "objects" of claims 1-3 & 24-27) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues (Paper #8: page 2, line 11 - page 3, line 11) that Examiner has erred in equating the "slices" grabbed by the Roye image reading operation with the "objects" recited in the rejected claims. Based on Applicant's asserted distinction between the Roye "slices" and the claimed "objects", Applicant argues that the claimed invention operates to find and process multiple "objects", and that the set of "slices" in Roye constitute but a single "object". For this reason, Applicant argues that Roye cannot be read on claim language that requires operations on multiple "objects".

Art Unit: 2624

However, a reading of the language of rejected claims 1-3 & 24-27 does not indicate any characteristic of the recited "objects" which precludes Examiner's reading of each "slice" in the Royce reference on a separate "object". In the absence of any claim language that precludes this reading, Applicant's alleged distinction is not applicable to these claims.

6. Applicant's arguments concerning the Lien reference (Paper #8: page 3, line 12 - page 5, line 4) have been considered but are moot in view of the withdrawal of that ground of rejection.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2624

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 703-305-4390. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 703-308-7452.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 703-306-0377.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 703-872-9314.

Stephen M Brinich
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

smb *Smb*
May 6, 2003



THOMAS D.
~~TOBY~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER